

**AB Litigation Services**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

Case No. 5:22-CV-00869-JKP-HJB

---

REMOTE VIDEO RULE 30(b)(6)  
DEPOSITION OF AFLCMC#4  
BY DESIGNEE JARED EKHOLM  
May 7, 2025

---

DR. JOHN ROE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**APPEARANCES:**

ALLEN VELLONE WOLF HELFRICH & FACTOR, P.C.

By Jason R. Wareham, Esq.

1600 Stout Street, Suite 1900

Denver, Colorado 80202

303.534.4499

jwareham@allen-vellone.com

Appearing remotely on behalf of  
Plaintiff

HENDLEY & HODGES LAW, PLLC

By John W. Hodges, Jr., Esq.

4594 US Highway 281 N

Spring Branch, Texas 78070

210.714.0924

john@hhtx.law

Appearing remotely on behalf of  
Plaintiff

DEFENDANT'S  
EXHIBIT

**3**

**AB Litigation Services**

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. We're on the  
3 record this morning at 12:02 Eastern Time, 10:02  
4 Mountain Time. Today is Wednesday, May 7th, 2025.  
5 This begins the 30(b)(6) deposition of Air Force Life  
6 Cycle Management Center No. 4, whose designee is  
7 Colonel Jared Ekholm, taken in the matter of Roe  
8 versus United States of America, et al.

9 This deposition is being recorded via Zoom  
10 videoconferencing. The court reporter is Teresa  
11 Cardenas. The videographer is Dan Schmitz. Counsel  
12 will introduce themselves and the parties they  
13 represent beginning with plaintiff's counsel first.

14 MR. WAREHAM: Hi, I'm Jason Wareham. I'm  
15 lead counsel in this matter for plaintiff. I'm  
16 joined along with John Hodges and then my paralegal  
17 Rebecca Bradshaw.

18 MS. SEEMAN: Good afternoon. This is  
19 Katrina Seeman joined by Robert Green and Joseph  
20 Gonzalez on behalf of the government defendants.

21 JARED EKHOLM,  
22 having been first duly sworn to state the whole  
23 truth, testified as follows:

24 EXAMINATION

25 BY MR. WAREHAM:

***AB Litigation Services***

1           Q       Okay. Great. All right. Well, the first  
2       few sets of questions are going to be pretty broad,  
3       but we'll -- we'll kind of work through it. And the  
4       first question I'm going to is No. 1 on our sheet,  
5       which is the comprehensive overview of HNCO's  
6       organizational structure, functions,  
7       responsibilities, and reporting lines regarding cyber  
8       programs, security clearances, and contractor  
9       oversight. Are you prepared to answer questions  
10      about that today?

11          A       I am prepared.

12          Q       Okay. So can you -- and for your clarity  
13      and clarity of the record, I use HNCO and Air Force  
14      Life Cycle Management Center somewhat  
15      interchangeably. I think I -- I prefer HNCO just  
16      because the other one is quite a, you know, mouthful.  
17                  Can you just give a high-level overview of  
18      HNCO's organizational structure, what command they  
19      fall under, how it's organized within the office, and  
20      the like, and -- and I'll ask follow-up questions  
21      after that.

22          A       Yeah, I'll be happy to -- to eliminate  
23      that one for you. And so what I will be talking to  
24      is the agency organization at the time of this event.  
25      And if it has changed, I'm not aware of those.

*AB Litigation Services*

1 Q Okay, great.

2 A So during the event, HNCO was largely  
3 organized into -- into a matrix organization.  
4 Internally, we had several different branches. They  
5 were platforms, access, payloads, and then a fourth  
6 one called black label. Each one of those was  
7 basically charged with functions of developing,  
8 acquiring, and fielding and sustaining separate  
9 weapon systems through those.

10 When you looked at -- we also had other  
11 organizations that were matrixed in. Those included  
12 finance, security, contracting, administration, and  
13 portfolio management. These functions serve more  
14 broad-based and would serve those four ones I  
15 previously mentioned across.

16 Outside external kind of leadership, most  
17 of our administrative and acquisition functions were  
18 governed by AFLCMC and all of those chains through  
19 the Air Force. We also had several other reporting  
20 channels that included our requirements that we got  
21 to which capabilities we were being asked to field.  
22 Those largely came from air combat command who owned  
23 the authorities to tell us which requirements that  
24 the Air Force needed, as well as to give us your  
25 funding allocations to what we could spend

*AB Litigation Services*

1 resource-wise on those specific efforts. So we  
2 would -- we would report elements such as what  
3 capabilities were being developed, the cost of those,  
4 as well as fielding dates to that organization.

5 Tangentially to that, AQL also served as a  
6 requirement of funding authority for us, more focused  
7 on the SAP and classified programs. Not wholly, but  
8 they certainly focused more on that area. They would  
9 also provide us requirements as well as funding to go  
10 after those specific activities. So those broader  
11 levels, that's what we really -- kind of how the  
12 agency was organized at the time frame.

13 When it came down to specific contractor  
14 oversight, that was mainly managed by our contracting  
15 officer representatives as assigned, as well as the  
16 warranted contracting officers and their team. To  
17 make sure that the contracts AFLCMC had, in fact,  
18 awarded or the Air Force awarded, basically the --  
19 the contract and the work that was being done was in  
20 accordance with the contract itself.

21 Q Okay. That was a very helpful answer.  
22 I'm going to check on one thing.

23 MR. WAREHAM: Court reporter, are you able  
24 to get everything down with the speed he's currently  
25 talking?

**AB Litigation Services**

1 onboard it and certify it for the weapon systems.

2 Q Okay. Well, very helpful. Thanks.

3 So can you help me understand the  
4 internal -- and this might not be a term that's  
5 perfect for you, so if you want to change it, feel  
6 free, but the internal chain of command of HNCO for,  
7 like, oversight and supervision? How is that  
8 organized?

9 MS. SEEMAN: Objection to form. You can  
10 answer. Go ahead.

11 THE DEPONENT: Okay.

12 A Yeah, so internal oversight would have  
13 been those four areas were all -- there was a person  
14 appointed to each one of those, and they would have  
15 reported directly to me for basically authority of  
16 what they were looking at and what they were doing.

17 We also had additional ones that were  
18 stepping out of there mainly for referrals and  
19 recommendations. That's where ACC, AQL, and all of  
20 our other partners would have been participants as  
21 well.

22 Q Okay. And at the time of this -- this  
23 incident -- and let's just assume that I -- that's  
24 always what I'm asking for time period is this time  
25 period. Who was in the highest level of command of

**AB Litigation Services**

1 HNCO?

2 A That would be myself.

3 Q And what was your billet description or  
4 title?

5 A I would have been the material leader of  
6 HNCO.

7 Q Okay. Did you have special court martial  
8 convening authority?

9 A I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?

10 Q Did you have special court martial  
11 convening authority?

12 A No, I did not. A material leader does not  
13 contain G series orders, so I do not have court  
14 martial authority.

15 Q Got it. So -- and forgive me. I was in  
16 the Marine Corps a long time, and sometimes Air Force  
17 translation can be a little different.

18 Is it fair to describe your role as, like,  
19 section head or -- or -- I mean, I guess contrast for  
20 me the commander's role versus your role in HNCO, if  
21 that's a better question?

22 MS. SEEMAN: Objection to form. You can  
23 answer.

24 THE DEPONENT: Okay.

25 A Yeah, so that -- that was -- that's a good

***AB Litigation Services***

1 distinction. So I would have been in charge of the  
2 acquisition elements of this to ensure we're meeting  
3 the requirements in the funding profiles and we're  
4 executing contracts to according to where they need  
5 to know.

6 I believe you're looking for -- if we had  
7 actually investigation on terms of G series orders,  
8 that would actually be handled through AFLCMC. The  
9 commander there, in fact, does have G series orders,  
10 and they would be the ones to be able to instill  
11 that.

12 Q Okay.

13 A That authority is often delegated down to  
14 a separate individual that governs multiple branches  
15 that was outside of our chain.

16 Q Got it. Okay. So on the day to day as  
17 the material leader, who reported directly to you as  
18 material leader?

19 A That would have been any number of  
20 individuals within HNCO, the four branch chiefs  
21 specifically and a number of civilians as well.

22 Q So that's -- that's where I wanted to go  
23 is -- is -- so what level of -- what level of  
24 personnel is below you by billet title?

25 A Branch chiefs.



**AB Litigation Services**

1 and timeline regarding HNCO's referral of allegations  
2 against Dr. Roe -- you know, for understanding  
3 purposes that -- that also means Dr. Royston. From  
4 Dr. Roe to OSI, including all communications,  
5 instructions, and formal or informal coordination.  
6 Are you prepared to answer that question?

7 A I am prepared, yes.

8 Q Okay. Can you start with a narrative and  
9 timeline regarding HNCO's referral of allegations  
10 against Dr. Roe.

11 A Yeah. So the first one would have been --  
12 one of the documents that we have dated 8/19/2020  
13 would have been the first one. We would have started  
14 encouraging -- or encountering with AFOSI due to some  
15 peculiarities that we started noticing or questions  
16 that we had at our level. And we would have been  
17 seeking AFOSI's guidance and expertise in what we  
18 should do next.

19 Q And do you have that document you  
20 referenced in front of you?

21 A I do.

22 Q What is the little number in the bottom  
23 right-hand corner?

24 A The last three is 276.

25 Q Okay. So was that, to your knowledge,

***AB Litigation Services***

1 the -- the first communication in the timeline  
2 regarding allegations made against Dr. Roe?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Okay. Where did it go from there? What  
5 was next?

6 A The next would have been -- Major McVeigh  
7 would have drafted that MFR that was asked for in  
8 this memo to begin capturing all of the events  
9 that -- and incidences that we knew at the time so we  
10 could have a body of evidence.

11 Q When you say "Major McVeigh," just for  
12 clarity of the record, at the time he was Captain  
13 McVeigh?

14 A Yes. Yes.

15 Q And help me understand where he fit within  
16 the described complaint escalation situation, right,  
17 the -- what we just described. Help me understand  
18 how he -- how his involvement would be -- fit within  
19 what we described earlier.

20 A Yeah, so Major McVeigh would have been my  
21 single focal point at our level for all staff-level  
22 programs. He would have been primary interface back  
23 to AQL to make sure that HNCO was pulling together  
24 all of the specific documentation that AQL would  
25 require.

**AB Litigation Services**

1 But things within his scope would have  
2 been making sure we had accurate tracking of all the  
3 projects and programs we were administrating for AQL  
4 at the SAP level. All of the funding profiles that  
5 we were doing, he would have been the one building  
6 those for ultimate presentation back to AQL to make  
7 sure we were executing things in accordance with what  
8 AQL was wanting to be delivered and the funding that  
9 they were provided.

10 He was also, as with all military officers  
11 and everybody assigned there, asked to always look  
12 out for any kind of security, fraud, waste and abuse  
13 instances and be able to report those as anybody  
14 noticed.

15 Q And as I understand it, in the narrative  
16 of the allegations, Captain McVeigh was the initial  
17 accuser?

18 A He would have been the ones to -- to first  
19 highlight the concern.

20 Q Okay. And, yet, it was also his role  
21 to -- to, like, develop and file the memorandum for  
22 record?

23 MS. SEEMAN: Objection to form.

24 You can answer.

25 A Yes.

***AB Litigation Services***

1           Q           (BY MR. WAREHAM) Is it common in that  
2 process to have both -- actually, I'm going back --  
3 for clarity, I'm going back now to --

4                   MS. SEEMAN: Back to 7? Thank you.

5                   MR. WAREHAM: Yeah.

6           Q           (BY MR. WAREHAM) Is it common in that  
7 process to have -- I'm going to use the term accuser,  
8 it makes sense to me; but however you want to think  
9 of it -- the initial accuser also be the one to do  
10 the memorandum for record?

11                   MS. SEEMAN: Objection to form.

12                   You can answer.

13           A           Yes, I would like the accuser, the person  
14 to -- who is noticing these -- these facts that are  
15 on the ground that we have to be able to write those  
16 up for -- for later adjudication by myself or other  
17 authorities.

18           Q           (BY MR. WAREHAM) And so apologies if I  
19 read into something or I misunderstood earlier, so I  
20 just want to clarify the process a little more.

21                   I understood kind of the reporting or the  
22 handling of complaints to be handled at, like, the  
23 next level of leadership from where the complaint  
24 was. So can you tell me -- I want to ask this  
25 question better.

***AB Litigation Services***

1                   Can you tell me if there was -- if the  
2   process included analysis of complaints by somebody  
3   above the person that was -- that was actually making  
4   the complaint?

5           A       Yes, that would occur.

6           Q       Okay. And did that occur here, going back  
7   to 9.

8           A       Yes, it did. When I was notified of the  
9   MFR, that's when I appointed a Rich Bremer to look  
10   into this matter further to gain an unbiased opinion  
11   of what was going on.

12          Q       All right. And so going back, again, to  
13   9, the narrative and timeline. So do you recall  
14   the -- the narrative and timeline from when the first  
15   day that Captain McVeigh, as you said, noticed  
16   problems with Dr. Roe?

17          A       I'm just prepared to answer that first  
18   time on the 8/19/2020.

19          Q       Okay. You're not familiar -- I mean, is  
20   there any reason to think that's not the first day he  
21   noticed that?

22          A       Maybe in verbal correspondence back and  
23   forth at some point.

24          Q       Okay. But you don't have any recollection  
25   of that?

**AB Litigation Services**

1           A       That's correct.

2           Q       Okay. So it went from that first email to  
3 the MFR. What happened after the MFR and then what  
4 date was the next event?

5           A       So the next event that would have occurred  
6 would have been on Tuesday, August 25th, where I  
7 would have wanted to reach out and begin that  
8 secondary kind of look, that inquiry to make sure  
9 that we had an unbiased opinion and what facts we  
10 were going through. So that's when I would have  
11 reached out to a Mr. Robert Brown, who is actually  
12 the supervisor of Mr. Bremer, just ask for his  
13 permission to use one of his employees to conduct  
14 this little inquiry.

15          Q       And to your knowledge and preparation,  
16 were there any other communications occurring between  
17 these two written events?

18          A       No.

19          Q       So you don't recall having any oral  
20 communications with Captain McVeigh about this or the  
21 like?

22          A       I don't specifically recall dates and  
23 timelines for those.

24          Q       Do you know if they existed?

25          A       I definitely had a conversation with

***AB Litigation Services***

1 Major McVeigh as he was writing that MFR.

2 Q Okay. Do you recall what that was?

3 MS. SEEMAN: Objection, form.

4 You can answer.

5 A Can you specify on what "that" is?

6 Q (BY MR. WAREHAM) The conversation you had  
7 with Mr. Major McVeigh, then Captain McVeigh, while  
8 he was doing his MFR?

9 A Yeah, he just would have come into my  
10 office, and he would have been -- simply said, Hey,  
11 I'm starting to notice these things. Here's the  
12 facts as I'm starting to see them. And at that  
13 point, I would have agreed, like, Yes, this is --  
14 this is time to elevate. This is something I want to  
15 be engaged with, so please start capturing all this  
16 information in the memorandum for record so we can  
17 move forward.

18 Q All right. And did you have any  
19 communication with anyone above your level as to this  
20 incident?

21 A That information is outside the scope of  
22 my preparation.

23 Q Do you recollect any communications  
24 relating to contacting the COTR on this?

25 A Can you repeat the name?

***AB Litigation Services***

1           Q       The COTR, so the -- the -- the contracting  
2       technical representative.

3           A       Oh, the COTR. Yes.

4           Q       COTR. Sorry.

5           A       No, I do not.

6           Q       Okay. Okay. So after -- going back to  
7       the timeline, after the -- the last event you  
8       described, were there any other additional events in  
9       the timeline relevant to this issue?

10          A       So the next couple of events would have  
11       been officially assigning or requesting that  
12       Mr. Bremer conduct this inquiry on my behalf.

13          Q       And what -- were there any other attendant  
14       communications that you're aware of related to that  
15       event?

16          A       No.

17          Q       What event occurred after the -- the last  
18       event you described and on what date?

19          A       So the next event, after gaining  
20       concurrence from Mr. Brown that it was okay to use  
21       Mr. Bremer as a resource, I would have officially  
22       appointed Mr. Bremer to conduct this investigation or  
23       inquiry, and it would have been on 25 August 2020.

24          Q       And do you have both of those  
25       correspondence for those events in front of you?



***AB Litigation Services***

1           A       Yes, I do.

2           Q       Can you tell me what the number is in the  
3       bottom right-hand corner for each?

4           A       The MFR requesting Mr. Bremer as the  
5       appointment of inquiry official is No. 741.

6           Q       And the next one?

7           A       The next one would have been Mr. Brown  
8       basically concurring -- this would have actually  
9       happened beforehand on the 25th of August -- to make  
10      sure that he, in fact, concurred that it was eligible  
11      for me to use Mr. Bremer in this capacity.

12          Q       All right. What was the next event in the  
13      chain of title relevant to this issue?

14          A       The next event would have been the -- the  
15      letter of -- from Mr. Bremer basically requesting  
16      additional time to complete his inquiry.

17          Q       Okay. And do you have that for me?

18          A       Yes, Mr. Bremer would have sent that to me  
19      on 9/9/2020.

20          Q       And what is the bottom right-hand number  
21      for that event or that document?

22          A       7 -- it is 745.

23          Q       Okay. All right. What's the next event  
24      in the timeline that occurred?

25          A       The next event in the timeline would have

***AB Litigation Services***

1 have actually been Mr. Bremer submitting his report  
2 from his inquiry. It would have occurred on  
3 9/22/2020. And the number for that one is 744.

4 Q Okay. All right. Then what was the next  
5 event after that?

6 A The letter we would have received from  
7 Mr. Bremer, it indicated that there was no -- no  
8 compromise of information at this point. Everything  
9 had been done in accordance with our policies and  
10 procedures, and he offered no corrective actions at  
11 the time. So no further actions would have been  
12 done.

13 Q Okay. But there was an event in this  
14 timeline where Dr. Roe was read out of the program.  
15 Are you familiar with that event?

16 A Yes, I am.

17 Q When did that occur?

18 A He was officially read out on 08/26/2020.

19 Q Okay. And what is -- well, were there any  
20 other relevant events between the -- the -- his  
21 report and Dr. Roe being read out?

22 A Yes. The two other events that we would  
23 have been informed of is one is the prime contractor  
24 had terminated his -- his subcontract, so he no  
25 longer had a contract -- or the -- the government no

**AB Litigation Services**

1 longer had a reason to keep him read in for that  
2 purposes. And he had also been read out -- or he had  
3 resigned from NSA at the time.

4 Q All right. Any other events that we have  
5 yet to cover?

6 A Not to my knowledge.

7 Q Okay. All right. Was there any --  
8 besides what we described, was there any other  
9 additional formal or informal coordination that  
10 occurred to your recollection relevant to this issue?

11 A No.

12 MR. WAREHAM: All right. Well, we have  
13 reached the point where I am now going to check in  
14 with my team. So if we could take ten minutes off  
15 record, and I'll be right back, okay?

16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. The time is  
17 1:08 p.m. Eastern Time, 11:08 Mountain Time. And  
18 we're off the record.

19 (Recess taken, 11:08 a.m. to 11:17 a.m.)

20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 1:17 p.m.  
21 Eastern Time, 11:17 a.m. Mountain Time. And we're  
22 back on the record.

23 MR. WAREHAM: All right. I don't actually  
24 have any further questions. So thank you very much.  
25 Your -- your counsel may have some supplemental

**AB Litigation Services**

1 STATE OF COLORADO)  
2 ) ss. REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE  
3 COUNTY OF DENVER )

4 I, Teresa L. Cardenas, do hereby certify  
5 that I am a Registered Professional Reporter and  
6 Certified Realtime Reporter within the State of  
7 Colorado; that previous to the commencement of the  
8 examination, the deponent was duly sworn to testify  
9 to the truth.

10 I further certify that this deposition was  
11 taken in shorthand by me at the time and place herein  
12 set forth, that it was thereafter reduced to  
13 typewritten form, and that the foregoing constitutes  
14 a true and correct transcript.

15 I further certify that I am not related to,  
16 employed by, nor of counsel for any of the parties or  
17 attorneys herein, nor otherwise interested in the  
18 result of the within action.

19 In witness whereof, I have affixed my  
20 signature this 19th day of May, 2025.

21

22

23

24

25



Teresa L. Cardenas, CRR, RPR  
216 - 16th Street, Suite 600  
Denver, Colorado 80202